

**MINUTES OF THE ADVISORY DESIGN PANEL MEETING HELD ON
April 14, 2022 AT THE DISTRICT OF NORTH VANCOUVER**

ATTENDING: Mr. Kelvin Lit (KL)
Mr. Joshua Bernsen (JB)
Mr. Jean-Pierre Mahé (JPM)
Mr. James Blake (JBI)
Ms. Nancy Paul (NP)
Mr. Don Aldersley (DA)
Mr. Rajesh Kumar (RK)
Sgt. Kevin Bracewell (KB)
Mr. Nathan Shuttleworth

REGRETS: Ms. Alexis Chicoine (AC)

STAFF: Ms. Emel Nordin (Item 3)
Mr. Alfonso Tejada
Mr. Kevin Zhang (Staff Liaison)
Ms. Taylor Jenks

APPLICANT: Mr. Ian Patillo, Wesgroup Properties
Mr. Collin Truong, Architect
Mr. Rhys Leitch, M. Arch
Ms. Josephine Wiens, Landscape Architect

1. ANNOUNCEMENTS AND ADMINISTRATION

- Mr. James Blake noted the missing panel members and began the meeting.

Mr. Blake opened the meeting at 6:05 pm.

2. ADOPTION OF MINUTES

A motion was made by Mr. Don Aldersley, seconded by Jean-Pierre Mahé, and carried, to adopt as amended the minutes of the Advisory Design Panel meeting of February 10, 2021.

Mr. James Blake welcomed the applicant team and explained the rules of procedure for the ADP meeting.

3. NEW BUSINESS

a.) Address: 1031-1045 Ridgewood Drive – 6:08 p.m.

Project: Detailed Application for an Official Community Plan (OCP) amendment, Rezoning, and Development Permit (DP) Application(s).

- **Proposed is a 32 unit townhouse development.**

Ms. Emel Nordin, Development Planner, provided a brief presentation on the project.

- Overview of the OCP and zoning of the properties including land use, density, dedication for green spine, and surrounding context which includes Grosvenor to the West, Amica to the South, and single Family to north and east/southeast.
- Proposed development requires an OCP Amendment and Rezoning as well as a DP to accommodate 1.19 FSR and a new CD Zone.
- Proposal is for 32 units, in five, three-storey buildings and one-storey underground parking garage
- Changes were highlighted since the previous proposal was brought forward by Boffo.
- The proposal addresses design guidelines of the Edgemont Village Centre Plan, as the properties are intended for three-storey ground-oriented townhouse development.
- The neighbouring site is intended for ground floor multi family housing in a lower density.
- The applicable DPAs were noted.
- Items that staff are seeking input on:
 - North and South elevations of Building 1 – whether the edges need to be softened through colour or articulation;
 - Elevation of the east side of Building 4;
 - Roof on Building 3 and potential ways to reduce impact; and
 - General feedback on colour palette and materials.

Mr. Rhys Leitch, M. Arch presented the project on behalf of Collin Truong, Architect (in attendance) and highlighted the following information for consideration:

- Key intent of the project is to provide a range of units – accessible 2 bedrooms, and two and three-storey townhomes.
- Attempting to encourage sustainability features through passive house certification but this can have impacts on the style of the project and create a more modern form.
- CPTED – clearly defined points of entry, overlook into public and private areas.
 - Looking for further input from the panel on these points of entry into the site.
- Small public plaza is proposed on the Northwest corner.
- The applicant highlighted the “Enhanced Accessible” floorplans.
- Shadow studies indicate that the project is not significantly impacting properties in the vicinity.

Ms. Josephine Wiens, Landscape Architect provided a brief overview of the project landscaping and highlighted the following information:

- Corner plaza for public seating, tucked into landscaping.
- 3 points of entry, with accessible entry at the corner of Ridgewood and Ayr which accesses the courtyard.
- Small on-site amenity space at southwest corner of the site.
- Lighting focused on safety and wayfinding as well as signage and lighting on each unit – catenary lighting in social spaces
- Planting is a mix of native and adaptive species.

- Most of the trees cannot be retained but cedar hedge to the east will be retained to offer screening.
- Other than guardrails not proposing a lot of high walls, trying to keep to planted vegetation for privacy

Mr. Leitch presented a fly-through presentation of the property for the panel.

Chair opened up the floor to Panel for questions.

Q: In passive design, the north should be lit with more sunlight and windows rather than west and south as in the case of single family homes, but how is it possible to do a similar concept with this townhouse project?

A: The team worked with the energy consultant early in the design process to optimize passive design including the following:

- Reduced window sizes to reduce heat gain.
- Discreet overhangs and steps in the building
- Increased windows to the north where heat gain is not as significant.

Q: On page D.43 in the booklet it shows building section 1, I'm but curious what does section 2 look like? Looks like distance between Buildings 3 and 4 is wider than 2 and 5?

A: Separation between buildings is actually the same, the only change is at ground floor between Buildings 3 and 4 where it is larger. Worst case is 29 feet, best case is 3 to 4 feet more.

Q: Please clarify what is distance between Buildings 2 and 5 at ground floor

A: 28'9" which is the case everywhere, except for ground floor where it is larger between building 3 and 4 where we wanted to provide a deeper patio space and protection from the weather.

Q: On the sections, Building 2 appears raised higher with a jog in the slab – why did you do that?

A: To mitigate grade change and get entryways of the units in Building 2 up to grade level so you didn't have to step down into the units. It also means there's a 5% slope in the path in the courtyard.

Q: Granite cladding appears along the walls along the frontage, which street-facing walls have this?

A: All of the walls along Ayr Avenue (taller ones) and along Ridgewood as well (the stepped walls).

Q: For Edgemont this seems like a very sophisticated design, with the roofscapes and the response to the streets, it's like a modern brownstone. In your materials you have a lot of cementitious panels, can you elaborate on that?

A: It's a Ceraclad which has a hidden reveal joint, like a butt joint.

Trying to stay away from hardy panels for a more refined look. In a vertical plane it's more contemporary.

Q: You have used vinyl doors, is there an alternative?

A: All the doors and windows have to be Passive House certified and options are limited. There are now Canadian-made products but these are vinyl which is the least conductive option and seems to be why they're the most common for passive houses.

Q: The accessible unit seems well laid-out including placement of furniture to allow movement within the unit. It's hard to identify the room layouts in the other suites, but from what I can tell they look tight. Are they accommodating queen beds?

A: There are queens in every room except for the master which is king. We have used Wesbuild standards which accommodates 10 ft. headboards or better. One of the goals was to not provide large townhomes, but more of a moderate sized home to increase financial accessibility.

Q: On Building 1, is there a way to soften the wall facing Ridgewood Drive? Is there a way to flip the unit so the stairwell is against the street?

A: That was attempted, but it was a challenge to create as strong of an architectural expression to the west and the rhythm of the exterior was broken. Bringing the roofline down the façade creates a contemporary take on the corner and reduces visibility from the public realm instead of having the unit' interior space open to the public.

Q: Similar question as above, but regarding Building 4

A: The same answer was provided.

Q: It appears the overall colour scheme is quite greige and I wonder why?

A: Wesgroup wanted a subtle colour palette to allow the brick to stand out and maintain the brownstone look. Bringing another color in would take away from the brick.

Q: - Between Buildings 2 and 3 is there a walkway?

A: There isn't - one of the concerns is with fire department access and providing an alternate access, but we would be interested to hear thoughts on bringing a stair down through the middle of the site and whether that would be a CPTED concern.

Q: Is there a gate to underground parking?

A: Yes

Q: Visitor parking is not separated by anything other than by lines, is that correct?

A: Yes there are only 8 visitor stalls, which made it difficult to separate from the residential parking.

Q: Will the townhomes be individually addressed or will there be a collective address with unit numbers?

A: This would be up to the District.

Q: What is lighting treatment for the interior courtyard?

A: A series of wall lights in planter walls, and each building has lights by the entries and step lights in stairwells.

Q: So there will be 24 hour lighting, although subdued?

A: Yes.

Mr. Alfonso Tejada, Urban Design Planner, gave a brief presentation and provided the following comments for consideration:

- Very nice presentation and like how the architecture was presented.
- Character of corner of Ridgewood and Ayr - you addressed this already but it is concerning.
- The courtyard width shouldn't be less than 30 feet.
- Treatment of height and massing of Building 3:
- The height will impact the liveability of courtyard space especially for the units on the south of the site, and it will need a relaxation of requirements.
- 3D presentation showed the verticality of elevations along the courtyard. There aren't any major projections or nooks to give the sense of additional space. It appears cannon-like in the interior courtyard.
- The architecture is quite nice – very attractive and modern
- The presentation at street elevation with treatment on Ayr Street is appreciated
- Concern regarding the corner at Ayr and Ridgewood:
 - As indicated in the Edgemont Plan, the massing should be orientated to the major frontage street and corners should be oriented to both streets.
 - There should be soft edge to neighbouring uses, instead it is a dominant and austere corner cor.
- Colours should integrate with surrounding built context, the colour trends are dark black and charcoal and it's not really compatible with the eclectic character that is supposed to be part of the Edgemont guidelines.
- With regard to street orientation on cornered lots, they need to relate to both sides of the street – they should wrap the corner rather than belonging to one side and blocking off another side. There is a problem with the roofline facing the interior courtyard – not an issue from the street but the interior impact and livability of the units
- Building 1 lacks the integration into the other buildings on the same streetscape.
- Progression of materials is struggling, brick is only small pieces, but why not use brick in the larger surfaces rather than only on decorative pieces.

The following comments were provided from the panel:

- Appreciate the use of brick materials – would like to see it repeated on planter walls rather than granite on planter walls to create a cohesion.
- Regarding the planting on Ridgewood Drive - consider using different planting types to better respond to the different form and character and three types of buildings with varying materials along Ridgewood Drive.
- Appreciate the diversity of plant material and mix of native and adaptive species.
- Like the undulation of the pathway in the central courtyard, but the rhythm of trees on south side gets a bit lost because they're not consistently placed
- The materials should be extended from the project into the proposed plaza space at the corner, as part of the public realm.
- Appreciate the design team making this type of project fit on north shore lots.

- Building 1 does not have privacy in the patio at the back – anyone in Building 2 or 5 can see in.
- Buildings 2 and 3 are hiding the view from Buildings 4 and 5 – the rest of the units seem sub-par.
- There are limitations with passive design, but there is a lack of transition between Buildings 4 and 3 to the SF homes. With another design you could create undulation in the façade that would transition to the neighbouring sites more effectively.
- Buildings 1 and 2 - the blank wall with no wrap around doesn't do any justice to the corner perhaps using different materials or corner treatment would help.
- Concern with creating slabs and then hoping trees will grow on top of them – the landscaped trees are going to have difficulty growing in these locations and in the soil volume.
- Excellent package and the scale fits with the neighbourhood, this form of housing is needed.
- Regarding Building 1 elevations at the corner, it is not necessary to step back the building, and would also leave the roofline alone. Perhaps focus on the public plaza and bring some articulation and maybe some changes in materiality to that corner to bring the scale of the project down.
- Same with Building 2, nothing major that can't be worked out.
- In response to the planners' question #2 – the proposal could use additional articulation
- In response to the planner's question #3 – flat roofs on the pop-ups would add diversity and could help
- Appreciate the composition of materials.
- Regarding the center stairs, opt for something enclosed and light and bright, landscaped for CPTED reasons.
- In the accessible units should they not have a shower instead of a tub?
- With regard to the building height along Ridgewood, if they are all vaulted ceilings inside you could reduce the height of the ceiling to 7' and reduce pitch to 4:12 and you would save some height.
- A false dormer on top of the pitched roof on the corner unit would match symmetry of rooves on Ridgewood
- Suggest a break in siding or adding brick pattern to create some interest.
- For Edgemont this is a well thought out design, and it is not suggested that you do any add-ons or change roof pitch.
- To articulate the area, you could pop out a small form in the dining room and soften that with glazing on east and west facades, or you could use flowering trees instead of maple and create contrast in the landscaping rather than the building itself.
- Building 3 is a little high, you could move the roof access towards the street and away from the courtyard.
- You have kept to materiality palette and forms for Building 3 but the peaked roofs look like an after-thought rather than in keeping with the intended form; perhaps go with a flat roof or bring the peak down if it needs to be peaked.

- Why greige? Would suggest other colours, not orange or yellow but look at the brick and white paneling and maybe look for another colour to be introduced there, while still keeping it “sophisticated”.
- Massing and materials are appreciated, especially brick around entry doors although curious why some buildings don't have the brick detail so maybe consider introducing.
- Look at ways of minimizing the impacts of the proposed buildings on showing of the courtyard.
- On Building section 1 the pitched roofs on Building 3 is overpowering, appearing as 4 stories and affect Building 4, would support making that a flat roof or lower the height.
- Transition for Building 2 at grade is struggling on the elevations, more consideration could be given to this rather than just a jog between the two buildings both at the roof and at the base.
- Corner window could be added to Building 1 to create more of a presence and maybe take advantage of a view.
- Appreciates the suggestion for a roofline to flow over the side of the building, but not appropriate for these design guidelines.

Q: Is the strip between Buildings 4 and 5 accessible to the street at all?

A: No it goes down to the parkade.

- Lighting in the courtyard is quite good, however any landscaping cannot impede lines of sight from end to end of courtyard and entry points.
- Weak points is usually underground parking, in this case it's gated, but it's shared with visitors and bike parking, so make sure there are robust handles on the doors of bike storage to prevent theft of bikes .
- Ensure each unit has a clearly visible sign for units which should also be lit for responders.
- You've broken the mold with building 3 and the waterfall treatment on the corner, is there a way of moving the grey volume outwards a bit to exaggerate it and add some floor space to second and third floor as well as adding some articulation?
- Agreed this is a fantastic addition to Edgemont.
- Corner is elegant
- In the shadow studies even in June there is no sunlight, but not sure what can be done about it, but it will impact landscaping.
- Plant choices are appropriate for shady environment, and the planters are generous
- Appreciates that roof decks have been provided for people to access sunlight.
- Agreed that it is impressive in both form and character.
- Like to see passive housing, and don't have concerns with the corner treatment.

The chair offered an opportunity to have a general discussion

- Confirming that it is a detailed motion.

The Chair invited the Panel to compose a motion:

MOVED by Jean-Pierre Mahé and **SECONDED** by Kelvin Lit

THAT the ADP has reviewed the proposal and commends the applicant and recommends approval subject to review by staff.

CARRIED

None opposed

3. Business


Kevin thanked the panel for their time for the ADP awards – no new business.

4. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 7:48 p.m.

5. NEXT MEETING

To be determined.



Chair
for
Don Alderkey

June 9/2022

Date